



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,805	10/21/2003	Jac P. Dowens	2001-0189CON	4373

7590 09/22/2004

Mr. S. H. Dworetsky
AT & T Corp.
P. O. Box 4110
Middletown, NJ 07748

EXAMINER

TRIEU, VAN THANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2636

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/689,805

Applicant(s)

DOWENS ET AL.

Examiner

Van T Trieu

Art Unit

2636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. This application filed under former 37 CFR 1.60 lacks the necessary reference to the prior application. A statement reading "This is a continuation of Application No. 09/978,153, filed 16 October 2001, now U.S. Patent No. 6,693,530 should be entered following the title of the invention or as the first sentence of the specification. Also, the current status of all nonprovisional parent applications referenced should be included.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-6, 11-13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Benson** [US 5,650,800].

Regarding claim 1, the claimed receiving surveillance profile from security equipment that has detected a security breach (the control panel 30 receives the profiles stored in EEPROM memory 36 for each of the intelligent sensor loops 80a, 80b and non-intelligent sensor loops 80c, 80d that has detected a security breach such as intruder, break in or fire alarm by one of the sensors 84, 86 and 88, see Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, lines 1-14 and 36-52 and col. 5, lines 7-60); and the dispatching emergency services corresponding to the surveillance profile of the security equipment (the control panel 30 having microprocessor 32 controls to automatically dispatch a profile for each security event to a remote central station through telephone interface 56 and Agency Line 2 (72), see Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 61-67 and col. 6, lines 1-20); and the steps of receiving the surveillance profile from the security equipment (the control panel 30 receives ID code for each of the sensors with their geographic locations in a premises, and including of authorized personnel with a security code for arming, disarming or canceling of the security alarm system, and a voice and/or video graphic LCD display for displaying of

Art Unit: 2636

the detected sensor location and its ID, see Figs. 1-9, col. 3, lines 1-67, col. 4, lines 1-9, col. 5, lines 38-60, col. 8, lines 32-53, col. 9, lines 6-67 and col. 10, lines 1-38).

Regarding claim 2, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claim 1 above, and including the processor (the microprocessor 32, see Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 3, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claims 1 and 2 above, and including the microprocessor 32 and memory 36 for storing surveillance profile, see Fig. 2.

Regarding claim 4, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claim 1 above, and including the broadband connection via network interface 54 and bus line 38, see Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 38-60.

Regarding claim 5, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claim 1 above, and the claimed DSL or cable modem line is met by the telephone line 70 to personal computer, see Figs. 2 and 4, col. 5, lines 61-67, col. 6, lines 1-20 and col. 8, lines 1-31.

Regarding claim 6, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claims 1 and 5 above, and the step of request verification (see col. 6, lines 58-67 and col. 7, lines 1-2); and the receiving a predetermined authorization code (receiving the unique ID code or the user code, see col. 5, lines 24-27 and 51-60).

Regarding claim 11, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claim 1 above, wherein the remote central station could be a fire department in case of a fire or the local police department in case of intruder and others breaches.

Regarding claim 12, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claim 1 above, wherein the emergency services personnel could be fireman, policeman, and/or doctor/medical personnel.

Regarding claim 13, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claim 12 above.

Regarding claim 21, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claims 6 and 12 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 7-8, 14-20 and 22-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Benson** [US 5,650,800] in view of **Menard et al** [US 6,356,192].

Regarding claim 7, **Benson** fails to disclose the at least one of calling a designated telephone number to request the predetermined authorization code from an answering party and transmitting the request for the predetermined authorization code to a designated internet protocol (IP) address for the processor corresponding to the detecting security equipment. However, **Benson** teaches that information pertaining to authorized user names and pass codes. The main control panel has in its memory a list of sensor ids, and security or fire telephone numbers through a telco interface 56.

Various actions are carried out depending upon the state of the monitored sensor loops such as determining what telephone numbers will be dialed through telephone line 1(70) when there is a panic alarm, when there is a stripped fire sensor, etc. to communicate critical signals to a central monitoring agency, or telephone line 2(72) for a lesser priority to communicate general system status with its ID to the system manufacturer, see Figs. 1 and 2, col. 2, lines 65-67, col. 3, lines 1-4, col. 5, lines 61-67, col. 6, lines 1-20 and

col. 8, lines 32-40. **Menard et al** suggests that upon detection of an event of interest, the detector PDU 20 communicates that information to the programmable controller PCP 512 allows a user, who may be in diverse geographic locations to control the detector PDU 20. The inter-protocol and inter-network communication may be managed separately, for example, both paging and cellular networks and modules communicate with each other through an IP-based protocol over the internet, see Figs. 1, 2, 5 and 7, col. 2, lines 26-59, col. 4, lines 8-64 and col. 6, lines 38-48. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the IP communications of **Menard et al** for the telephone line of **Benson** because the internet signals can provide through the telephone lines that including both voices and written messages to the user or authorization personnel such as police, central operator, which gives a higher effective of delivering messages and determination of an action quicker.

Regarding claim 8, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** in respect to claim 7 above, and including the calling a sequence of designated telephone numbers until the first of receiving a response by an answering party, see col. 5, lines 61-67 and col. 6, lines 1-20.

Regarding claim 14, **Benson** fails to disclose the receiving GPS information for individual emergency services personnel including those from police departments, fire departments and medical technician. However, **Benson** teaches that the security

Art Unit: 2636

system includes a telco interface 56 being adapted to communicate between the detectors/sensors and the central monitoring agency, see Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 61-67 and col. 6, lines 1-20. **Menard et al** suggests that a GPS receiver is incorporated and the system transmits GPS coordinates along with the detection signals to the central monitoring station, see Figs. 5 and 7, col. 11, lines 41-54. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the GPS receiver of **Menard et al** to the security system of **Benson** because the GPS receiver is small device that provides faster and accurately to locating and/or finding position of any monitored sensors, individuals or objects within a large area.

Regarding claim 15, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** in respect to claims 12 and 14 above.

Regarding claim 16, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** in respect to claim 15 above.

Regarding claim 17, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** in respect to claim 16 above.

Regarding claim 18, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** in respect to claim 16 above.

Art Unit: 2636

Regarding claim 19, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** in respect to claim 18 above.

Regarding claim 20, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** in respect to claim 18 above, and the DSL or cable modem line, see Fig. 2.

Regarding claim 22, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** in respect to claims 7 and 21 above.

Regarding claim 23, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** in respect to claim 22 above.

Regarding claim 26, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** in respect to claim 16 above.

5. Claims 9, 10, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Benson** and **Menard et al** and further in view of **Saylor et al** [US 6,400,265].

Regarding claim 9, **Benson** fails to disclose the receiving a predetermined authorization code includes receiving a personal identification number verbally using a voice recognition methodology. However, **Benson** teaches that information pertaining to

Art Unit: 2636

authorized user names and pass codes. The main control panel has in its memory a list of sensor ids, and security or fire telephone numbers through a telco interface 56, see Figs. 1 and 2, col. 2, lines 65-67 and col. 3, lines 1-4. **Saylor et al** suggests that a system and method for monitoring security system comprising a database 140 containing user's profiles and preference information. An individual's system or systems of security devices 110-114 are connected to a central security network 130. A voice service VSS 16, call server 18 including a software components 181 and hardware components 182, and subscribers interface 20 comprises a system through which subscribers request data and reports through a variety of ways and are verbally provided with their results through an interactive voice broadcast IVB. A voice recognition module is used to provide voice recognition functionally for a call server 181, see Figs. 1, 2, 4, 7 and 12, col. 2, lines 2-56, col. 4, lines 18-65, col. 6, lines 56-63, col. 10, lines 20-38, col. 19, lines 39-58 and col. 20, lines 18-30. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the call server of **Saylor et al** for the telco interface of **Benson and Menard et al** for increasing security of the system to accurately identify of the authorized personnel being communicated.

Regarding claim 10, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson and Menard et al** and **Saylor et al** in respect to claims 8 and 9 above.

Art Unit: 2636

Regarding claim 24, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** and **Saylor et al** in respect to claims 9 and 22 above.

Regarding claim 25, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Benson** and **Menard et al** in respect to claims 9 and 23 above.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Thompson discloses a implant medical devices to be monitored and tracked anywhere in the world by a two-way communications with the patient and data/programming communications with the implant medical device to be initiated by medial staff. The location of patient and the implanted device are determined in an emergency. Emergency response teams can be dispatched to determine the patient location with necessary information. [US 6,083,248]

Neeson et al discloses an apparatus for tracking reporting and recording equipment inventory on a locomotive equipped with a mobile communications package MCP operatively connected to onboard intelligent devices. The MCP is able to receive the dispatcher. [US 5,786,998]

Aspell et al discloses an vehicle or other object tracking and locating system comprising a novel transponder apparatus for use identifying the presence of an object interrogated by broadcast radio activation command signals on a predetermined RF

Art Unit: 2636

carried carrying ID code to that object and its transponder. [US 4,098,629] and [US 4,818,998]

Hogan et al discloses a security and fire protection system comprising a plurality of smoke detector-transmitter units and a plurality of intrusion detector-transmitter units mounted at various positions throughout premises to be protected. [US 4,641,127]

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to primary examiner **Van Trieu** whose telephone number is (571) 272-2972. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. **Jeffery Hofsass** can be reached on (571) 272-2981.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Van Trieu', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Van Trieu
Primary Examiner
Date: 9/17/04